

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)
) v. Criminal No. 12-30034:003-MAP
)
AIDA HERNANDEZ,)
) Defendant)

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
CONCERNING PLEA OF GUILTY

Defendant, by consent, has appeared before me pursuant to Rule 11, Fed. R. Crim. P., and Rule 5 of the Rules for United States Magistrates in the District of Massachusetts, and has entered a plea of guilty to Count I of the Information. After cautioning and examining Defendant under oath concerning each of the subjects mentioned in Rule 11, I determined that the guilty plea was knowledgeable and voluntary and that the offenses charged are supported by an independent basis in fact establishing each of the essential elements of such offenses. I therefore recommend that the plea of guilty be accepted and that Defendant be adjudged guilty and have sentence imposed accordingly.¹

DATED: September 11, 2012

/s/ Kenneth P. Neiman
KENNETH P. NEIMAN
U.S. Magistrate Judge

¹ Defendant is hereby advised that, under the provisions of Rule 3(b) of the Rules for United States Magistrates in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, any party who objects to these findings and recommendations must file a written objection with the Clerk of this Court **within fourteen (14) days** his or her receipt of this Report and Recommendation. The written objection must specifically identify the portion of the proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made and the basis for such objection. Defendant is further advised that failure to comply with this rule shall preclude further appellate review by the Court of Appeals of the District Court order entered pursuant to this Report and Recommendation. See *Keating v. Secretary of Health & Human Services*, 848 F.2d 271, 275 (1st Cir. 1988); *United States v. Valencia-Copete*, 792 F.2d 4, 6 (1st Cir. 1986); *Scott v. Schweiker*, 702 F.2d 13, 14 (1st Cir. 1983); *United States v. Vega*, 678 F.2d 376, 378-379 (1st Cir. 1982); *Park Motor Mart, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co.*, 616 F.2d 603, 604 (1st Cir. 1980). See also *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 154-55 (1985).